

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action, mailed August 10, 2007, considered claims 1-34. Claims 1-11, 14, 16-24, 27 and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mani et al ("Use SOAP-based intermediaries to build chains of Web service functionality", Mani, Anbazhagan and Nargarajan, Arun, September 2, 2002, <<http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/webservices/library/ws-soapbase/>>), hereafter *Mani*.¹ Claims 12-13, 15, 25-26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mani as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of what Examiner designated as well known in the art at the time of the invention.

By this amendment claims 1-34 have been amended and no claims have been cancelled or added.² Accordingly, claims 1-34 are pending, of which claims 1, 18, 32 and 34 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to dispatching a received message without having direct access to information relevant for the dispatch. For example, claim 1 defines receiving a message at the receiving computing system. Next, claim 1 defines passing the received message through one or more receiving path components that are positioned in the receiving path of the message prior to being passed to the dispatching component, the passing of the received message to the dispatching component occurring within the receiving computing system, each of the receiving path components in the receiving path being components of the receiving computing system.

Claim 1 further defines at least one of the one or more receiving path components modifying the message with at least one modification, the modification including information that is not included in the received message. Next, claim 1 defines the dispatching mechanism receiving the modified message from the receiving path within the receiving computing system. Lastly, claim 1 defines, based on the information obtained in the modification, the dispatching mechanism using the obtained information to dispatch the message to a group of one or more methods within the receiving computing system for further processing, where the dispatching

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0007], [0028]-[0030] and Figures 2 & 3.

includes transferring the modified received message to the group of one or more methods within the receiving computing system for further processing.

Claim 18 is a computer program product claim similar to claim 1. Claim 32 is a method claim similar to claim 1 that includes functional language. Claim 34 is a system claim generally corresponding to claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

Mani describes a system for passing a SOAP message from a client to a service provider through a series of intermediary servers (see Fig. 2). Each intermediary can add/delete/modify fields in the SOAP message header and thereby change attributes of the message. For example, intermediaries can change the messages intended path by adding new intermediaries to the routing path (p. 2, par. 7). Each intermediary represents a separate computing system. Thus, as Figure 2 illustrates, the SOAP message path begins at a service client computing system, goes through intermediary computing systems A & B, and ends at the destination computing system, the service provider.

Thus, *Mani* fails to teach or suggest passing the received message through one or more receiving path components that are positioned in the receiving path of the message prior to being passed to the dispatching component, the passing of the received message to the dispatching component occurring within the receiving computing system, each of the receiving path components in the receiving path being components of the receiving computing system, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, *Mani* fails to teach or suggest, based on the information obtained in the modification, the dispatching mechanism using the obtained information to dispatch the message to a group of one or more methods within the receiving computing system for further processing, where the dispatching includes transferring the modified received message to the group of one or more methods within the receiving computing system for further processing, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 18, 32 and 34 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 18, 32 and 34, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claims 1, 18 and 32 included the terms "may not" and "not easily." Claims 1, 18 and 32 have been amended to no longer include the terms "may not" and "not easily." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 1-33 be withdrawn.

Claims 18-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter. Claim 18 has been amended to recite "recordable-type computer-readable media." Applicants submit that this language causes claim 18, as well as claims 19-31 which depend from claim 18, to recite a tangible embodiment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 18-31 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-17, 19-31 and 33 were objected to for lacking proper antecedent basis. Claims 3 and 20 were objected to for minor grammatical errors. Claims 2-17, 19-31 and 33 have been amended to no longer include the term "a method" and now include the term "the method." Claims 3 and 20 have been amended to correct the minor grammatical informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 2-17, 19-31 and 33 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 12th day of November, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:GRL.ds
DS000008218V001